arXiv:1609.01146v1 [math.NA] 5 Sep 2016

Optimal Quadrature Formulas for the Sobolev Space H^1

Erich Novak[*]
Mathematisches Institut, Universität Jena
Ernst-Abbe-Platz 2, 07743 Jena, Germany
email: erich.novak@uni-jena.de
Shun Zhang[†]
School of Computer Science and Technology, Anhui University,
Hefei 230601, China
email: shzhang27@163.com

September 6, 2016

Dedicated to Henryk Woźniakowski on the occasion of his 70th birthday

Abstract

We study optimal quadrature formulas for arbitrary weighted integrals and integrands from the Sobolev space $H^1([0,1])$. We obtain general formulas for the worst case error depending on the nodes x_j. A particular case is the computation of Fourier coefficients, where the oscillatory weight is given by $\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi i k x)$. Here we study the question whether equidistant nodes are optimal or not. We prove that this depends on n and k: equidistant nodes are *optimal* if $n \geq 2.7|k| + 1$ but might be suboptimal for small n. In particular, the equidistant nodes $x_j = j/|k|$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, |k| = n + 1$ are the *worst* possible nodes and do not give any useful information. To characterize the worst case function we use certain results from the theory of weak solutions of boundary value problems and related quadratic extremal problems.

[*]This author was partially supported by the DFG-Priority Program 1324.
[†]This author was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11301002).

1 Introduction

We know many results about optimal quadrature formulas, see Brass and Petras [2] for a recent monograph. This book also contains important results for the approximation of Fourier coefficients of periodic functions, mainly for equidistant nodes. As a general survey for the computation of oscillatory integrals we recommend Huybrechs and Olver [4].

It follows from results of [8, 9] that equidistant nodes lead to quadrature formulas that are asymptotically optimal for the standard Sobolev spaces $H^s([0,1])$ of periodic functions and also for C^s functions.

We want to know whether equidistant nodes are optimal or not. Žensykbaev [12] proved that for the classical (unweighted) integrals of periodic functions from the Sobolev space $W_p^r([0,1])$, the best quadrature formula of the form $A_n(f) = \sum_j a_j f(x_j)$ is the rectangular formula with equidistant nodes. Algorithms with equidistant nodes were also studied by Boltaev, Hayotov and Shadimetov [1] for the numerical calculation of Fourier coefficients. In their paper not only the rectangular formula was studied but all (and optimal) formulas based on equidistant nodes. It is not clear however, whether equidistant nodes are optimal or not.

We did not find a computation of the worst case error of optimal quadrature formulas for general x_j in the literature. Related to this, we did not find a discussion about whether equidistant nodes are optimal for oscillatory integrals or not. We find it interesting that the results very much depend on the frequency of oscillations and the number of nodes.

This paper has two parts. In the first part, we present general formulas for the worst case error for arbitrary weighted integrals in the Sobolev space H^1 for arbitrary nodes. In the second part we consider oscillatory integrals and prove that equidistant nodes are optimal for relatively large n, but can be very bad for small n.

We now describe our results in more detail. We study optimal algorithms for the computation of integrals

$$I_\varrho(f) = \int_0^1 f(x)\varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where the density ϱ can be an arbitrary integrable function. We assume that the integrands are from the Sobolev space H^1 and, for simplicity, often assume zero boundary values, i.e., $f \in H_0^1$. Here $H_0^1 = H_0^1([0,1])$ is the space of all absolutely continuous functions with values in $\mathbb{C}$ such that $f' \in L_2$ and $f(0) = f(1) = 0$. The norm in H_0^1 (and semi-norm in H^1) is given by $\|f\| := \|f'\|_{L_2}$. We simply write $\|\cdot\|_2$ instead of $\|\cdot\|_{L_2}$.

We study algorithms that use a "finite information" $N : H^1 \to \mathbb{C}^n$ given by

$$N(f) = (f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_n)).$$

We may assume that

$$0 \le x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n \le 1.$$

We prove general results for the worst case error for arbitrary ϱ and nodes $(x_j)_j$ and then study in more detail integrals with the density function $\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi i k x)$. Here we want to know whether equidistant nodes are optimal or not. We shall see that this depends on n and k: equidistant nodes are optimal if $n \ge 2.7|k| + 1$ but might be suboptimal for small n. In particular, the equidistant nodes $x_j = j/|k|$ for $j = 0, 1 \ldots, |k| = n + 1$ are the *worst* possible nodes and do not give any useful information. To characterize the worst case function we use certain results from the theory of weak solutions of boundary value problems and related quadratic extremal problems.

The aim of this paper is to prove some exact formulas on the nth minimal (worst case) errors, for $F \in \{H_0^1, H^1\}$,

$$e(n, I_\varrho, F) := \inf_{A_n} \sup_{f \in F:\, \|f\|_F \le 1} |I_\varrho(f) - A_n(f)|.$$

This number is the worst case error on the unit ball of F of an optimal algorithm A_n that uses at most n function values for the approximation of the functional I_ϱ. The initial error is given for $n = 0$ when we do not sample the functions. In this case the best we can do is to take the zero algorithm $A_0(f) = 0$, and

$$e(0, I_\varrho, F) := \sup_{f \in F:\, \|f\|_F \le 1} |I_\varrho(f)| = \|I_\varrho\|_F.$$

Let us collect the main results of this paper:

(i) For general (integrable) weight functions $\varrho : [0,1] \to \mathbb{C}$, we derive formulas for the initial error (Proposition 2) and for the radius of information (worst case error of the optimal algorithm) for arbitrary nodes (Theorem 3).

(ii) We study oscillatory integrals with the weight function $\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi i k x)$ for the space $H_0^1([0,1])$. In Proposition 6 we compute the initial error for $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ and the main result is Theorem 9 for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, where we prove that equidistant nodes are optimal if $n \ge 2.7|k| - 1$.

(iii) Then we study the full space $H^1([0,1])$ and again prove that equidistant nodes are optimal for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ and large n. See Theorem 13 for the details. We could prove very similar results also for the subspace of $H^1([0,1])$ of periodic functions or for functions with a boundary value (such as $f(0) = 0$). Since the results and also the proofs are similar, we skip the details.

(iv) In Section 4 we discuss results for equidistant nodes $x_j = j/n$, for $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$, and prove certain asymptotic results (which are the same for equidistant and optimal nodes). In particular we obtain

$$\lim_{|k|\to\infty} e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \cdot |k| = \frac{1}{2\pi}$$

for each fixed n and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \cdot n = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$$

for each fixed $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$.

2 Arbitrary density functions

We start with

$$I_\varrho(f) = \int_a^b f(x)\varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$$

for $f \in H_0^1([a,b])$ and want to compute the so called initial error

$$e_0 := \sup_{\|f\|\le 1} |I_\varrho(f)|.$$

Since the complex valued case is considered here, the inner product in the spaces $H_0^1([a,b])$ is given by

$$\langle f, g\rangle = \int_a^b f'(x)\overline{g'(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Using the integration by parts formula we see that the initial error is given by

$$e_0 = \sup_{\substack{\|f'\|_2\le 1 \\ \int_a^b f'=0}} \left| \int_a^b f'(x)\cdot R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right|,$$

where $R(t) = \int_a^t \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ for $t \in [a,b]$. To solve the extremal problem

$$\sup_{\substack{\|g\|_2\le 1 \\ \int_a^b g=0}} \left| \int_a^b g(x)R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \right|,$$

we decompose R into a constant c and an orthogonal function $\widetilde{R}$, $R = \widetilde{R} + c$, hence $c = \frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $\widetilde{R} = R - c$ and $\int_a^b \widetilde{R}(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = 0$. It then follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz

inequality that every $g^* = \gamma \frac{\widetilde{R}}{\|\widetilde{R}\|_2}$ with $|\gamma| = 1$ solves the extremal problem and the respective maximum is $\|R - c\|_2 = \|\widetilde{R}\|_2$.

We define f^* by

$$f^*(t) = -\int_a^t \frac{\overline{R(x)} - \overline{c}}{\|R - c\|_2} \, \mathrm{d}x.$$

Then $f^*(a) = f^*(b) = 0$ and $f^* \in H_0^1([a,b])$. Further,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_a^b f^*(x)\varrho(x) \, \mathrm{d}x &= \int_a^b f^*(x) \, \mathrm{d}R(x) \\
&= f^*(x)R(x)|_a^b - \int_a^b (f^*)'(x)R(x) \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&= -\int_a^b (f^*)'(x)(R(x) - c) \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_a^b \frac{\overline{R(x)} - \overline{c}}{\|R - c\|_2} \big(R(x) - c\big) \, \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \|R - c\|_2 .
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. It is easy to check that the property $R(a) = 0$ is not used in the above computations. Therefore it is not important what is chosen as the lower limit of the integral in the definition of R.

Hence we have proved the following proposition.

Proposition 2. Consider $I_\varrho : H_0^1([a,b]) \to \mathbb{C}$ with an integrable density function ϱ. Then

$$e_0 = \sup_{\|f\| \le 1} |I_\varrho(f)| = \|R - c\|_2,$$

where $R(t) = \int_a^t \varrho(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$ for $t \in [a,b]$ and $c = \frac{1}{b-a} \int_a^b R(x) \, \mathrm{d}x$. Moreover the maximum is assumed for $f^* \in H_0^1([a,b])$, given by

$$f^*(t) = -\int_a^t \frac{\overline{R(x)} - \overline{c}}{\|R - c\|_2} \, \mathrm{d}x,$$

i.e., $I_\varrho(f^*) = \|R - c\|_2$ and $\|f^*\| = 1$ with $f^*(a) = f^*(b) = 0$. □

The initial error e_0 clearly depends on a, b and ϱ and later we will write $e_0(a, b, \varrho)$ for it.

We are in a Hilbert space setting (with the two Hilbert spaces $H = H^1([0,1])$ and $H_0^1([0,1])$) and the structure of optimal algorithms $A = \phi \circ N$, for a given information $N : H \to \mathbb{C}^n$, is known: the spline algorithm is optimal and the spline σ is continuous and piecewise linear, see [10, Cor. 5.7.1] and [11, p. 110].

More exactly, if $N(f) = y \in \mathbb{C}^n$ are the function values at $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then $A(f) = \phi(y) = I_\varrho(\sigma)$. In the case $H = H_0^1([0,1])$ the spline σ is given by $\sigma(0) = \sigma(1) = 0$ and $\sigma(x_i) = f(x_i) = y_i$ and piecewise linear. In the case $H = H^1([0,1])$ the spline is constant in $[0, x_1]$ and $[x_n, 1]$, otherwise it is the same function as in the case $H = H_0^1([0,1])$.

Moreover, we have the general formula for the worst case error of optimal algorithms A

$$\sup_{\|f\|_H \le 1} |I_\varrho(f) - A(f)| = \sup_{\|f\|_H \le 1,\ N(f)=0} |I_\varrho(f)|.$$

This number is also called the radius $r(N)$ of the information N and to distinguish the two cases, we also write $r(N, H^1)$ and $r(N, H_0^1)$, respectively, see [10, Thm. 5.5.1 and Cor. 5.7.1] and [11, Thm. 2.3 of Chap. 1].

We are ready to present a general formula for $r(N, H_0^1)$ and afterwards solve another extremal problem to present the formula for $r(N, H^1)$.

We put $x_0 = 0$ and $x_{n+1} = 1$ and then have $n+1$ intervals $I_j = [x_j, x_{j+1}]$, where $j = 0, 1, \cdots, n$. For the norm $\|f\| := \|f'\|_2$, the worst case function f_j^* is, on any interval I_j, as in Proposition 2. The norm of f_j^* is one and the integral is $e_0(x_j, x_{j+1}, \varrho) =: c_j$. Then the radius of information of the information N is given by

$$r(N) = \max_{\substack{\alpha_j \ge 0 \\ \sum \alpha_j^2 = 1}} \sum_j \alpha_j \, e_0(x_j, x_{j+1}, \varrho)$$

and it is easy to solve this extremal problem. The maximum is taken for $\alpha_j = (\sum_j c_j^2)^{-1/2} c_j$ and then the total error is the radius of information, $r(N) = \sum_j \alpha_j c_j = (\sum_j c_j^2)^{1/2}$. As a result we obtain the following assertion.

Theorem 3. In the case of $H_0^1([0,1])$ the radius of information is given by

$$r(N) = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} e_0(x_j, x_{j+1}, \varrho)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

Moreover, the worst case function f^* is given by

$$f^*|_{I_j} = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j^2 \right)^{-1/2} \cdot c_j \cdot f_j^*,$$

where $c_j = e_0(x_j, x_{j+1}, \varrho)$. In particular we have $f^* \in H_0^1([0,1])$ with norm 1 and $N(f^*) = 0$ with $I_\varrho(f^*) = r(N)$. □

Now we turn to the space $H^1([0,1])$. In this case, we need a small modification for the intervals $[0, x_1]$ and $[x_n, 1]$ since the value of $f(0)$ is unknown if $x_1 > 0$ and $f(1)$ is unknown if $x_n < 1$.

For those functions $f \in H^1([a,b])$ satisfying $f(a) = 0$, we take $R(t) = \int_t^b \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $t \in [a,b]$. Then $R(b) = 0$ and the respective maximum is $\|R\|_2$. We define $f^* \in H^1([a,b])$ by

$$f^*(t) = \int_a^t \frac{\overline{R(x)}}{\|R\|_2}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Then $f^*(a) = 0$, $(f^*)'(b) = 0$ and $\|f^*\| = 1$. Afterwards,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_a^b f^*(x)\varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x &= -\int_a^b f^*(x)\,\mathrm{d}R(x) \\
&= -f^*(x)R(x)|_a^b + \int_a^b (f^*)'(x)R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_a^b (f^*)'(x)R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_a^b \frac{\overline{R(x)}}{\|R\|_2}R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \|R\|_2 .
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Similarly, for the functions $f \in H^1([a,b])$ satisfying $f(b) = 0$, we take $R(t) = \int_a^t \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $t \in [a,b]$. Then $R(a) = 0$ and the respective maximum is $\|R\|_2$. We define f^* by

$$f^*(t) = -\int_t^b \frac{\overline{R(x)}}{\|R\|_2}\,\mathrm{d}x.$$

Then $f^*(b) = 0$, $(f^*)'(a) = 0$ and $\|f^*\| = 1$. Also, $I_\varrho(f^*) = \|R\|_2$.

Hence, we obtain almost the same assertion for the full space $H^1([0,1])$ as in Theorem 3. Here, $c_0 = e_0(0, x_1, \varrho) = \|R\|_2$ on $[0, x_1]$ if $x_1 > 0$ and $c_n = e_0(x_n, 1, \varrho) = \|R\|_2$ on $[x_n, 1]$ if $x_n < 1$, instead of so-called $\|R - c\|_2$. Accordingly, f_0^* and f_n^* should be changed.

Observe that the initial error is infinite if $I(\varrho) \neq 0$ since all constant functions have a semi-norm zero. Therefore we now assume that $I(\varrho) = 0$. Then for the full space $H^1([0,1])$, the initial error of the problem I_ϱ is, as in (1),

$$e_0\left(H^1, \varrho\right) := \sup_{\|f\|_{H^1} \le 1} |I_\varrho(f)| = \|R\|_2, \tag{2}$$

where $R(t) = \int_t^1 \varrho(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$ for $t \in [0,1]$.

Remark 4. We can apply the theory of "weak solution of elliptic boundary value problems in the Sobolev Space H^1 and related extremal problems" in the simplest case, in particular Lax-Milgram Lemma (see [3, 6]), and we obtain the following fact: The boundary value problem

$$f'' = -\varrho, \qquad f(a) = f(b) = 0,$$

is equivalent to the extremal problem of finding the minimizer of the functional

$$J(f) = \frac{1}{2}\,\|f'\|_2^2 - \int_a^b f\varrho\,\mathrm{d}x,$$

where $f \in H_0^1([a,b])$. Hence the minimizer of this extremal problem is the unique solution of the boundary value problem. For the space $H_0^1([0,1])$ which was considered in Theorem 3 this gives just another proof of the same result.

If we now consider the full Sobolev space $H^1([0,1])$ then we obtain a slightly different extremal problem in the first interval $[a,b] = [0,x_1]$ and in the last interval $[a,b] = [x_n,1]$. The extremal problem for the first interval is: Minimize J as above where now f is from the set of $H^1([a,b])$ with $f(b) = 0$, while $f(a)$ is arbitrary. It is well known and easy to prove that the respective boundary value problem is

$$f'' = -\varrho, \qquad f'(a) = 0, f(b) = 0,$$

and similar for the last interval.

With these modifications, we obtain a formula for the radius $r(N)$ of the information for the space $H^1([0,1])$, the same formula as in Theorem 3, only the numbers $e_0(0,x_1,\varrho)$ and $e_0(x_n,1,\varrho)$ are defined differently, with the modified extremal problem or modified boundary value problem. □

Remark 5. In the case $\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi ikx)$, the worst case function is, in each interval $I_j = [x_j, x_{j+1}]$, of the form

$$f(x) = c_j \exp(-2\pi ikx) + a_j x + b_j,$$

with $f(x_j) = 0$ for $j = 1,\ldots,n$ and $f'(0) = 0$ if $x_1 > 0$ and $f'(1) = 0$ if $x_n < 1$.

3 Oscillatory integrals: optimal nodes

In this section we consider optimal nodes for integrals with the density function

$$\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi ikx), \qquad k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}, \qquad x \in [0,1].$$

The integrands are from the spaces $H_0^1([0,1])$ or $H^1([0,1])$, respectively.

3.1 The case with zero boundary values

We want to know whether in this case equidistant nodes, i.e.,

$$x_j = \frac{j}{n+1}, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n,$$

are optimal for the space $H_0^1([0,1])$ or not. We will see that they are optimal for large n, but not for small n.

Following Section 2, in this case we can consider a general interval $[a,b]$ and compute $R(x)$, constant c, and the initial error $\|R-c\|_2$. Then we obtain that the initial error depends only on k and the length $L = b-a$ of the interval, it is nondecreasing with L. We establish that equidistant $x_j = \frac{j}{n+1}$ are optimal for large n compared with $|k|$.

According to Remark 1, we modify the lower limit of the integral for $R(x)$ and define simply

$$R(x) := \int_0^x \varrho_k(t)\mathrm{d}t = \int_0^x e^{-2\pi ikt}\mathrm{d}t = \frac{e^{-2\pi ikx}-1}{-2\pi ik},$$

and

$$c := \frac{1}{b-a}\int_a^b R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x = -\frac{e^{-2\pi ikb}-e^{-2\pi ika}}{4\pi^2k^2L} + \frac{1}{2\pi ik}.$$

Then on the interval $[a,b]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|R-c\|_2^2 \\
&= \int_a^b \big(R(x)-c\big)\big(\overline{R(x)}-\overline{c}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x \\
&= \int_a^b R(x)\overline{R(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x - L\,c\,\overline{c} \\
&= \int_a^b \frac{e^{-2\pi ikx}-1}{-2\pi ik}\frac{e^{2\pi ikx}-1}{2\pi ik}\,\mathrm{d}x - L\left(-\frac{e^{-2\pi ikb}-e^{-2\pi ika}}{4\pi^2k^2L}+\frac{1}{2\pi ik}\right)\cdot\left(-\frac{e^{2\pi ikb}-e^{2\pi ika}}{4\pi^2k^2L}-\frac{1}{2\pi ik}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{4\pi^2k^2}\int_a^b 2\left(1-\cos(2\pi kx)\right)\,\mathrm{d}x - \frac{1-\cos(2\pi kL)}{8\pi^4k^4L} - \frac{-\sin(2\pi kb)+\sin(2\pi ka)}{4\pi^3k^3} - \frac{L}{4\pi^2k^2} \\
&= \frac{L}{4\pi^2k^2} - \frac{1}{8\pi^4k^4L}\left(1-\cos(2\pi kL)\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

which is independent of a and b and stays the same even if $R(x) := \int_a^x e^{-2\pi ikt}\,\mathrm{d}t$.

From Proposition 2, we easily obtain the following assertion concerning the initial error.

Proposition 6. Consider the oscillatory integral $I_{\varrho_k} : H_0^1([0,1]) \to \mathbb{C}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$. Then the initial error is given by

$$e_0 = \sup_{\|f\|\leq 1} |I_{\varrho_k}(f)| = \frac{1}{2\pi\,|k|}.$$

Moreover the maximum is assumed for $f^* \in H_0^1([0,1])$, given by

$$f^*(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi\,|k|}\left(e^{2\pi i k t} - 1\right),$$

i.e., $I_{\varrho_k}(f^*) = e_0$ and $\|f^*\| = 1$ with $f^*(0) = f^*(1) = 0$. □

Following Theorem 3, denote $L_j = |I_j|$, then $\sum_{j=0}^{n} L_j = 1$ and $c_j = \|R - \beta_j\|_2$ with $\beta_j = \frac{1}{L_j}\int_{I_j} R(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$. The radius of information is

$$\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j^2\right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{2\pi^2k^2}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\frac{1-\cos(2\pi k L_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2} = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\pi^2k^2}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\frac{\sin^2(\pi k L_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2}.$$

To make the worst case error as small as possible, we want to find the optimal distribution of information nodes $(x_j)_{j=1}^n$, in particular for large n. That is,

$$\inf_{\substack{L_j\geq 0,\\ \sum_{j=0}^{n} L_j = 1}} \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\pi^2k^2}\sum_{j=0}^{n}\frac{\sin^2(\pi k L_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2}.$$

For this, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 7. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, $0 = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n < x_{n+1} = 1$ and $L_j = x_{j+1} - x_j$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Suppose that $n + 1 \geq 2.7|k|$. Then

$$\sup_{\substack{L_j\geq 0,\\ \sum_{j=0}^{n} L_j = 1}} \sum_{j=0}^{n}\frac{\sin^2(\pi k L_j)}{L_j} = (n+1)^2\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{n+1}\right), \tag{4}$$

i.e., equidistant x_j with $L_j = \frac{1}{n+1}$ for all $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ are optimal.

Proof. Let $f(x) = \sin^2(\pi k x)/x$, $x \in (0,1]$, and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ without loss of generality. Then we have

$$f'(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}\left(\pi k x\sin(2\pi k x) - \sin^2(\pi k x)\right) = \frac{\sin(\pi k x)}{x^2}\left(2\pi k x\cos(\pi k x) - \sin(\pi k x)\right).$$

Solving the equation, $2t\cos(t) = \sin(t)$, i.e., $\tan(t) = 2t$, on the interval $(0, k\pi]$ with $t = \pi kx$, we get k solutions, $t_0^*,\ t_1^*, \ldots, t_{k-1}^*$, with $j\pi + \pi/3 < t_j^* < j\pi + \pi/2$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1$ and $t_{j+1}^* - (t_j^* + \pi) > 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-2$. This implies that

$$\sin(2t_j^*) > \sin(2t_{j+1}^*) > 0, \quad j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-2.$$

In particular, $t_0^* \approx 0.3710\pi < \pi/2$. A figure of the function $f(x) = \sin^2(\pi kx)/x$ on $(0, 1]$ with $k = 6$ is drawn by using Matlab, see Figure 1.



Figure 1: $y_1 = \sin^2(\pi kx)/x$ on $(0, 1]$ for $k = 6$, in contrast to $y_2 = 1/x$

The function f is nonnegative and $f(j/k) = 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$. We also put $f(0) = 0$ for continuity. In each interval $[j/k, (j+1)/k]$ with $j = 0, 1, \ldots, k-1$, the point $x_j^* := t_j^*/(k\pi)$ is the maximum point of the function f. Since

$$f(x_j^*) = f\left(\frac{t_j^*}{k\pi}\right) = k\pi\frac{\sin^2(t_j^*)}{t_j^*} = 2k\pi\frac{\sin^2(t_j^*)}{\tan(t_j^*)} = k\pi\sin(2t_j^*),$$

one knows that $f(x_0^*)$ is the maximum value on the whole interval $[0, 1]$. Moreover, the function f is monotone increasing on $[0, x_0^*]$ with $x_0^* \approx 0.3710/k < 1/(2k)$.

Next, for the second derivative of f on the interval $(0, x_0^*]$, we have

$$f''(x) = \frac{2}{x^3}\left(\sin^2(\pi kx) - \pi kx\sin(2\pi kx) + \pi^2k^2x^2\cos(2\pi kx)\right).$$

For this, we take $G(t) = \sin^2(t) - t\sin(2t) + t^2\cos(2t)$ with $t = \pi kx$. Then $G'(t) = -2t^2\sin(2t) < 0$ and $G(t) < G(0) = 0$ for $t \in (0, \pi/2)$, which yields that $f''(x) < 0 = f''(0)$

holds true on the whole interval $(0, x_0^*]$. Indeed, $f'(0) = \pi^2 k^2$, and using L'Hôpital's rule,

$$f''(0) = \lim_{x\to 0^+} f''(x) = 2(\pi k)^3 \cdot \lim_{t\to 0^+} \frac{G'(t)}{(t^3)'} = 0.$$

Now we turn to the distribution of the nodes $x_j, j = 1, \ldots, n$, with $n+1 \geq 1/x_0^* \approx 2.6954k$. We consider two cases depending on whether $L_j > x_0^*$ holds for some $j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ or not. We first assume that $L_j \leq x_0^*$ for all $j = 0, \ldots, n$. Thanks to the above properties on the first and second derivatives of f, we know that f is concave on $(0, x_0^*]$. Using the Lagrange multiplier method, we obtain that equidistance is the optimal case, i.e., $L_0 = L_1 = \cdots = L_n$. If $L_{j_0} > x_0^*$ holds for some $j_0 \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\}$, we have $f(L_{j_0}) < f(x_0^*)$ and easily construct a better distribution, $\{L_j^{(1)}\}_j \subset (0, x_0^*]$, in the following steps.

Step 1: Since $L_{j_0} > x_0^*$ and $n + 1 \geq \frac{1}{x_0^*} \approx 2.7k$, we define $L_{j_0}^{(1)} = x_0^*$ simply, which "saves" $L_{j_0} - x_0^*$ (on length) for the summation to compute.

Step 2: For the other j satisfying $L_j > x_0^*$, we repeat Step 1.

Step 3: Due to $n + 1 \geq \frac{1}{x_0^*}$ and $L_{j_0} > x_0^*$, there exists some j satisfying $L_j < x_0^*$. The "saving" length of $L_j^{(1)}$'s from Steps 1 and 2 can be given to those $L_j < x_0^*$, such that for all $j = 0, 1 \ldots, n$, $L_j \leq L_j^{(1)} \leq x_0^*$ and $\sum_j L_j^{(1)} = 1$.

Since the function f is monotone increasing on $[0, x_0^*]$, the above steps yield that $f(L_j^{(1)}) \geq f(L_j)$ holds true for all $j = 0, 1 \ldots, n$. Hence, the proof is finished as required. □

Remark 8. In the case $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, Lemma 7 stays the same. There are only some small modifications in the proof. Firstly, for the equation, $2t\cos(t) = \sin(t)$, on the interval $(0, |k|\pi]$ with $t = |k|\pi x$, the number of solutions is $\lfloor |k| \rfloor$ or $\lceil |k| \rceil$, depending on $|k|$. Secondly, the expressions of f' and f'' remain the same, respectively. In the other expressions for positive numbers, one can replace k by $|k|$ simply. In particular, the maximum point of f is $x_0^* \approx 0.3710/|k|$ in $[0, 1]$ if $|k| \geq 0.3710$, otherwise 1. □

We are now ready to give sharp estimates on the worst case error.

Theorem 9. In the case of $H_0^1([0, 1])$ with $\varrho_k(x) = \exp(-2\pi ikx)$ and $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, the radius of information is given by

$$r(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{1}{k^2\pi^2}\sum_j \frac{\sin^2(\pi k L_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2},$$

where $L_j = x_{j+1} - x_j,\ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, with $0 = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \cdots < x_n < x_{n+1} = 1$.

Moreover, if $n \geq 2.7|k|-1$, then equidistant nodes ($L_j = \frac{1}{n+1},\ j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$) are optimal and the worst case error is

$$e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H_0^1) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{(n+1)^2}{k^2\pi^2}\sin^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{n+1}\right)\right)^{1/2}.$$

□

Furthermore, we establish a few nice asymptotic properties for the nth minimal errors as follows.

Corollary 10. Under the same assumption of Theorem 9, the following statements hold:

(i) For fixed $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ and (optimal) equidistant nodes, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H_0^1) \cdot n = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}.$$

(ii) For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and arbitrary nodes, we have

$$\lim_{|k|\to\infty} e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H_0^1) \cdot |k| = \frac{1}{2\pi}.$$

(iii) Suppose in addition that $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$. Then for fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and arbitrary nodes,

$$\lim_{|k|\to\infty} \frac{e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H_0^1)}{e(0, I_{\varrho_k}, H_0^1)} = 1.$$

□

Proof. Point (i) can be proved via Taylor's expansion in the same manner as in Theorem 17. Point (ii) is known from the result for the radius of information in Theorem 9. This implies point (iii) by Proposition 6.

□

Remark 11. What is the optimal distribution of information nodes if $n + 1 < 2.6954|k|$ for the supreme term on the left side of (4)? In the case of $n = |k| - 1$ equidistant nodes are the worst nodes. Observe that in this case these n function values are useless: the radius of information is the same as the initial error of the problem. Further, the radius of information on equidistant nodes is oscillatory (no more than the initial error) as n increases

from 1 to $\lfloor |k| \rfloor - 1$ if $|k| \geq 3$, and it is monotone decreasing (with the asymptotic constant $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$ mentioned above) as n increases from $\max(1, \lceil |k| \rceil - 1)$ to infinity.

Even, in the cases $n+1 = 2|k|, 2.5|k|, 2.6|k|$ we can show that equidistant nodes are not always optimal by Matlab experiments, see Table 1. We compare the worst case errors $\hat{e}_n^{\rm equi} := e^{\rm equi}(n, I_{\varrho k}, H_0^1)$ (for nodes $x_j = \frac{j}{n+1}$) with $\hat{e}_n^{\rm opt} := e^{\rm opt}(n, I_{\varrho k}, H_0^1)$ (for optimal nodes) and compute the so-called relative errors, $\hat{d}_n^{\rm equi} := (\hat{e}_n^{\rm equi} - \hat{e}_n^{\rm opt})/\hat{e}_n^{\rm opt}$.

Table 1: Counterexamples for equidistance by Matlab

$\frac{n+1}{k}$	k	$n+1$	$\hat{e}_n^{\rm equi}$	$\hat{e}_n^{\rm opt}$	$\hat{e}_n^{\rm equi} - \hat{e}_n^{\rm opt}$	$\hat{d}_n^{\rm equi}$
2	72	144	$1.68133 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$1.60478 \cdot 10^{-3}$	$7.66 \cdot 10^{-5}$	+4.8%
2.5	194	485	$5.36217 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$5.34544 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$1.67 \cdot 10^{-6}$	+0.31%
2.6	290	754	$3.47616 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$3.47567 \cdot 10^{-4}$	$4.90 \cdot 10^{-8}$	+0.014%

Related to the field of digital signal processing, a famous assertion, the Nyquist Sampling Theorem states that, see [5, 7]: If a time-varying signal is periodically sampled at a rate of at least *twice* the frequency of the highest-frequency sinusoidal component contained within the signal, then the original time-varying signal can be exactly recovered from the periodic samples. It seeks in essence for the reconstruction of continuous periodic functions. In contrast, for oscillatory integrals of periodic functions from H^1, the multiple number 2.7 assures that equidistant nodes achieve the optimal quadrature. □

3.2 The general case

We want to find optimal nodes,

$$0 \leq x_1 < \cdots < x_n \leq 1,$$

for the oscillatory integrals and integrands from the full space $H^1([0,1])$ with $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. We will prove some nice formulas for large n, but not for small n. For convenience we take $x_0 = 0,\ I_j = [x_j, x_{j+1}]$ and $L_j = |I_j|$.

To compute the number $r(N)$ as in Theorem 3 with arbitrary nodes mentioned above, firstly we consider the initial errors for all intervals under the assumption $N(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0$.

On the intervals $I_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we know from (3) that the initial error is $\|R - c\|_{2,j}$

with

$$\|R-c\|_{2,j}^2 := \int_{x_j}^{x_{j+1}} \big(R(x)-c\big)\big(\overline{R(x)}-\overline{c}\big)\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{L_j}{4\pi^2k^2} - \frac{1}{8\pi^4k^4L_j}\left(1-\cos(2\pi kL_j)\right).$$

On the interval $I_0 = [0, x_1]$, we obtain from (1) that the initial error is $\|R_0\|_{2,0}$ with $R_0(t) = \int_0^t \varrho_k(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $t \in [0, x_1]$, and for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$,

$$\|R_0\|_{2,0}^2 := \int_0^{x_1} R_0(x)\cdot\overline{R_0(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{4\pi^2k^2}\left(2L_0 - \frac{\sin(2\pi kL_0)}{\pi k}\right).$$

Similarly on the interval $I_n = [x_n, 1]$, the initial error is $\|R_n\|_{2,n}$ with $R_n(t) = \int_t^1 \varrho_k(x)\,\mathrm{d}x$, $t \in [x_n, 1]$, and for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$,

$$\|R_n\|_{2,n}^2 := \int_{x_n}^1 R_n(x)\cdot\overline{R_n(x)}\,\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{4\pi^2k^2}\left(2L_n - \frac{\sin(2\pi kL_n)}{\pi k}\right).$$

As usual, the initial error is given by taking the zero algorithm $A_0(f) = 0$. If $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, we have $I(\varrho_k) = 0$, and by (2),

$$e(0, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) = \sup_{f\in H^1:\,\|f\|\le 1} |I_{\varrho_k}(f)| = \sup_{f\in H^1:\,\|f\|\le 1} |I_{\varrho_k}(f - f(0))| = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2\pi|k|}.$$

Following the same lines as in Section 3.1, the radius of information is,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\|R-c\|_{2,j}^2 + \|R_0\|_{2,0}^2 + \|R_n\|_{2,n}^2\right)^{1/2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(L_0 - \frac{\sin(2\pi kL_0)}{\pi k} + L_n - \frac{\sin(2\pi kL_n)}{\pi k} + 1 - \frac{1}{\pi^2k^2}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{\sin^2(\pi kL_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2}.$$

Suppose in addition that $n-1 \ge 2.7|k|$. Following Lemma 7, we obtain that for any fixed nodes $x_1, x_n \in [0,1]$, equidistant x_j with $L_{j-1} = \frac{x_n - x_1}{n-1}$ for all $j = 2, \ldots, n-1$ are optimal. Afterwards, we have to find the optimal nodes, $x_1 =: x$ and $x_n =: 1-z$, for

$$\inf_{\substack{x,y,z\ge 0,\\ x+(n-1)y+z=1}} \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k} + z - \frac{\sin(2\pi kz)}{\pi k} + 1 - \frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2k^2}\frac{\sin^2(\pi ky)}{y}\right)^{1/2}.$$

For this, we prove the following lemma.

Lemma 12. Let $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ and $n-1 \geq 2.7|k|$. Then for

$$\inf_{\substack{x,y,z\geq 0,\\ x+(n-1)y+z=1}} \left(x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k} + z - \frac{\sin(2\pi kz)}{\pi k} + 1 - \frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2 k^2}\frac{\sin^2(\pi ky)}{y} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{5}$$

the unique solution of the minimum point $(x,z) = (x^*, z^*)$ satisfies that $x^* = z^*$ and x^* is the stationary point of the function,

$$S(x) = 2x - \frac{2\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k} - \frac{(n-1)^2}{\pi^2 k^2}\frac{\sin^2\left(\pi k \cdot \frac{1-2x}{n-1}\right)}{1-2x},$$

in the interval $\left(0,\ \min\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{6|k|}\right)\right)$ and dependent of $|k|$ and n. □

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $k \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $z \leq 1/2$ since $x+(n-1)y+z = 1$. Let us begin with the steps below.

Step 1: For any fixed $z = z_0$, we discuss by $x + (n-1)y = 1 - z_0 \geq 1/2$. We prove now that the unique solution of the minimum point for $x = \widetilde{x}$ (depending on k, n and z_0) should appear in $(0, 1/(6k))$.

That is to consider

$$\inf_{\substack{x,y\geq 0,\\ x+(n-1)y=1-z_0}} \left(x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k} - \frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2 k^2}\frac{\sin^2(\pi ky)}{y} \right).$$

We take $f(y) = \sin^2(\pi ky)/y,\ y \in (0,1],\ f(0) = 0$ as in Lemma 7,

$$F_1(x) = \frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2 k^2} f(y) \quad \text{with} \quad y = \frac{1-z_0-x}{n-1} \in \left[0, \frac{1-z_0}{n-1}\right],$$

and

$$g_1(x) = x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k}, \quad x \in [0, 1-z_0].$$

Define $S_1(x) := g_1(x) - F_1(x),\ x \in [0, 1-z_0]$. Under the assumption of $n-1 \geq 2.7|k|$, we have $0 < \frac{1-z_0}{n-1} \leq \frac{1}{n-1} < x_0^* \approx 0.3710/k$. Afterwards, for $y \in [0, \frac{1-z_0}{n-1}],\ f'(y) > 0$ and

$$F_1'(x) = \frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2 k^2} \cdot y_x' \cdot f'(y) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} f'(y) < 0,\ x \in [0, 1-z_0].$$

This helps us to decompose the function $S_1(x)$ into two parts, $x - F_1(x)$ and $-\sin(2\pi kx)/(\pi k)$. One part, $x - F_1(x)$, is monotone increasing on $[0, 1-z_0]$. The other, $-\sin(2\pi kx)/(\pi k)$, is

$1/k$ -periodic. This implies that the minimum point $x = \widetilde{x}$ for $S_1(x)$ appears in $[0, 1/(4k)]$, more precisely $(0, 1/(6k))$, see the details below.

Indeed, one can assume first that $1/(6k) \le 1 - z_0$. Then $g_1'(x) = 1 - 2\cos(2\pi kx)$ is increasing from -1 to 0 on the interval $[0, 1/(6k)]$ and positive on $(1/(6k), 1/(4k)]$. Since f'' is negative on $(0, x_0^*]$ and $f'(x_0^*) = 0$, we obtain that

$$F_1''(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} \cdot y_x' \cdot f''(y) = \frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1} \cdot f''(y) < 0, \quad x \in [0, 1 - z_0],$$

and for some $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$F_1'(0) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} f'\left(\frac{1 - z_0}{n-1}\right) =: -\delta_1 > F_1'\left(\frac{1}{6k}\right) \ge F_1'(1 - z_0) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} f'(0) = -1.$$

By the intermediate value theorem, there is one point $\widetilde{x} \in (0, 1/(6k))$ such that $S_1'(\widetilde{x}) = g_1'(\widetilde{x}) - F_1'(\widetilde{x}) = 0$. Moreover, the monotonicity of $g_1' - F_1'$ assures the uniqueness of $\widetilde{x}$.

In the case $1/(6k) > 1 - z_0$, we have that $g_1'(x) = 1 - 2\cos(2\pi kx)$ is increasing from -1 to $-\delta_2$ on the interval $[0, 1 - z_0]$ where $\delta_2 \in (0, 1)$. Similarly, for some $\delta_1 \in (0, 1)$,

$$F_1'(0) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} f'\left(\frac{1 - z_0}{n-1}\right) =: -\delta_1 > F_1'(1 - z_0) = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2} f'(0) = -1.$$

Then there is one point $\widetilde{x} \in (0, 1 - z_0) \subset (0, 1/(6k))$ such that $S_1'(\widetilde{x}) = g_1'(\widetilde{x}) - F_1'(\widetilde{x}) = 0$, and the monotonicity of $g_1' - F_1'$ assures the uniqueness of $\widetilde{x} \in \left(0, \min\left(1 - z_0, \frac{1}{6k}\right)\right)$.

Step 2: Iterate the above process by fixing $\widetilde{x}$. From $z + (n-1)y = 1 - \widetilde{x} > 1 - \min\left(1 - z_0, \frac{1}{6k}\right) \ge z_0$, we obtain a new minimum point for $z = \widetilde{z} \in \left(0, \min\left(1 - \widetilde{x}, \frac{1}{6k}\right)\right)$.

Step 3: Iterate the process by fixing y above. One knows easily $x + z = 1 - (n-1)y < 1/(3k)$ and considers

$$g_1(x) = x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k}, \quad x \in \left[0, \frac{1}{3k}\right].$$

Then

$$g_1''(x) = 4\pi k \sin(2\pi kx) > 0, \quad x \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3k}\right].$$

This implies, by Lagrange multiplier method, that $x = z = p/2$ is the unique solution of the extremal problem,

$$\inf_{\substack{x,z \ge 0,\\ x+z=p}} \left(x - \frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k} + z - \frac{\sin(2\pi kz)}{\pi k}\right) \qquad \text{for any fixed} \quad p \in \left[0, \frac{1}{3k}\right].$$

The above three steps shift the extremal problem (5) to the simpler case below,

$$\inf_{\substack{x,y\geq 0,\\ 2x+(n-1)y=1}} \left(2x-\frac{2\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k}-\frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2k^2}\frac{\sin^2(\pi ky)}{y}\right).$$

We follow Step 1 with a few small modifications mainly on domains. Here we take

$$F(x)=\frac{(n-1)}{\pi^2k^2}f(y) \quad \text{with} \quad y=\frac{1-2x}{n-1}\in\left[0,\frac{1}{n-1}\right],$$

$$g(x)=2g_1(x)=2x-2\frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k}, \quad x\in\left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right],$$

and $S(x):=g(x)-F(x),\ x\in[0,\frac{1}{2}]$. Since $n-1\geq 2.7|k|$, we have $y\leq\frac{1}{n-1}\leq\frac{1}{2.7|k|}$ and $F'(x)<0,\ x\in\left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right]$.

This helps us to decompose the function $S(x)$ into two parts again, and the minimum point for $S(x)$ appears in $(0,1/(6k))$.

To be specific, $g'(x)=2-4\cos(2\pi kx)$ is increasing from -2 to 0 on $[0,1/(6k)]$. Since f'' is negative on $(0,x_0^*]$ and $f'(x_0^*)=0$, again we have

$$F''(x)=-\frac{2}{\pi^2k^2}\cdot y_x'\cdot f''(y)=\frac{4}{\pi^2k^2}\cdot\frac{1}{(n-1)}\cdot f''(y)<0,\ x\in\left[0,\frac{1}{2}\right).$$

If $1/(6k)\leq 1/2$, then for some $\delta\in(0,1)$,

$$F'(0)=-\frac{2}{\pi^2k^2}f'\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right)=:-2\delta>F'\left(\frac{1}{6k}\right)\geq F'\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)=-\frac{2}{\pi^2k^2}f'(0)=-2.$$

Otherwise, for $1/(6k)>1/2$, g' is increasing from -2 to $-2\delta'$ on $[0,1/2]$, and $F'(0)=:-2\delta>F'(1/2)=-2$, where $\delta,\delta'\in(0,1)$.

Therefore, there is only one point $x^*\in\left(0,\min\left(\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{6k}\right)\right)$ such that $S'(x^*)=g'(x^*)-F'(x^*)=0$. This gives the unique solution for (5).

In the case of $k\in\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, we use $|k|$ instead of k and mention that

$$g(x)=x-\frac{\sin(2\pi kx)}{\pi k}=x-\frac{\sin(2\pi|k|x)}{\pi|k|}.$$

Hence the proof is finished. □

This enables us to give sharp estimates on the worst case error for the full space $H^1([0,1])$.

Theorem 13. In the case of $H^1([0,1])$ with $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, the radius of information is given by

$$r(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(L_0 - \frac{\sin(2\pi k L_0)}{\pi k} + L_n - \frac{\sin(2\pi k L_n)}{\pi k} + 1 - \frac{1}{\pi^2 k^2}\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\frac{\sin^2(\pi k L_j)}{L_j}\right)^{1/2},$$

where $L_0 = x_1,\ L_j = x_{j+1} - x_j,\ j = 1, \ldots, n-1$ and $L_n = 1 - x_n$, with $0 \le x_1 < \cdots < x_n \le 1$.

Moreover, if $n-1 \ge 2.7|k|$, then $x_1 = 1 - x_n = x^*$ with x^* from Lemma 12, and equidistant $x_j = \frac{j-1}{n-1}\cdot(x_n - x_1) + x_1,\ j = 2, \ldots, n-1$, are optimal in the worst case. □

Remark 14. Although we do not give an explicit formula for the point x^* above, it is easy to obtain the numerical solution for x^* when k and n are known. We want also to ask whether equidistant nodes, $x_j = \frac{j}{n+1},\ j = 1, \ldots, n$, are optimal for some k and n. The answer is negative. Firstly, it can only happen if $n + 1 > 6|k|$. We take $t = \frac{|k|}{n+1} \in (0, 1/6)$ and find that, from Lemma 12,

$$S'\left(\frac{1}{n+1}\right) = 2 - 4\cos(2\pi t) + \frac{2}{\pi^2}\frac{\sin(\pi t)}{t^2}\left(2\pi t\cos(\pi t) - \sin(\pi t)\right) > S'(x^*) = 0, \qquad t \in \left(0, \frac{1}{6}\right).$$

This tells us that, $x^* < \frac{1}{n+1}$ if $n - 1 > 2.7|k|$. Even we have $x^* < \frac{1}{2n}$, since for the midpoint rule, i.e., $x_j = \frac{2j-1}{2n},\ j = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$S'\left(\frac{1}{2n}\right) = 2 - 4\cos(\pi t) + \frac{2}{\pi^2}\frac{\sin(\pi t)}{t^2}\left(2\pi t\cos(\pi t) - \sin(\pi t)\right) > 0, \qquad t = \frac{|k|}{n} \in \left(0, \frac{1}{3}\right).$$

That is, the endpoints nearby are much closer to the optimal x_1 and x_n than x_2 and x_{n-1}, respectively, with the distance $x^* < \frac{1}{2n} < \frac{1}{n+1} < \frac{1}{n} < \frac{1-2x^*}{n-1} = x_{j+1} - x_j < \frac{1}{n-1},\ j = 1, \ldots, n-1$. □

4 Oscillatory integrals: equidistant nodes

In this section, we want to discuss the case of equidistant nodes for the Sobolev space $H^1([0,1])$ of non-periodic functions. Throughout this section, we assume that one uses equidistant nodes

$$x_j = \frac{j}{n}, \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n. \tag{6}$$

This case was already studied by Boltaev et al. [1], using the S. L. Sobolev's method.

Then the oscillatory integral I_{ϱ_k} of the piecewise linear function σ (the spline algorithm) is given by

$$A_{n+1}^k(f) = I_{\varrho_k}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} a_j f(x_j), \tag{7}$$

where the coefficients a_j's are given as follows. We skip the proof since the result is known, see [1, Theorem 8].

Proposition 15. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $x_j = j/n$, $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Assume that $f : [0,1] \to \mathbb{C}$ is an integrable function with $f(x_0), f(x_1), \ldots, f(x_n)$ given, and σ is the piecewise linear function of f at $n+1$ equidistant nodes $\{x_j\}_{j=0}^n$. Then $I_{\varrho_k}(\sigma) = \sum_{j=0}^n a_j f(x_j)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
a_0 &= \frac{n}{4k^2\pi^2}\left(1 - \frac{2\pi i k}{n} - e^{-2\pi i k/n}\right), \\
a_j &= \frac{n}{k^2\pi^2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi k}{n}\right) e^{-2\pi i k j/n}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, n-1, \\
a_n &= \frac{n}{4k^2\pi^2}\left(1 + \frac{2\pi i k}{n} - e^{2\pi i k/n}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

and $\sum\limits_{j=0}^{n} a_j = 0$. □

Remark 16. We comment on the weights a_j in Proposition 15. Obviously, for every $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_j e^{2\pi i k j/n} \cdot n = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} a_0 \cdot n = \lim_{n\to\infty} a_n \cdot n = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that for sufficiently large n, the linear algorithm is almost a QMC (quasi Monte Carlo) algorithm with equidistant nodes, which is used in [8]. □

Clearly, from Theorem 9, the algorithm A_{n+1}^k with equidistant nodes is optimal for the space H_0^1 in the worst case if $n \geq 2.7|k|$. Here, n stands for the number of the intervals. Boundary values are fixed for $f \in H_0^1([0,1])$, i.e., $f(0) = f(1) = 0$.

Furthermore, we have the following assertion for the space H^1, in which the point (i) is already proved in [1, Theorem 9].

Theorem 17. Consider the integration problem I_{ϱ_k} defined for functions from the space $H^1([0,1])$. Suppose $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \neq 0$.

(i) The worst case error of A^k_{n+1}, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, is

$$e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{n^2}{k^2\pi^2}\sin^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)\right)^{1/2}.$$

(ii) For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) < e(0, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}, \text{ if } k \neq 0 \bmod n.$$

(iii) For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\lim_{|k|\to\infty} e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \cdot |k| = \frac{1}{2\pi}.$$

(iv) For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\frac{1}{n}.$$

(v) For fixed $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$, we have the sharp constant of asymptotic equivalence $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}$, i.e.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \cdot n = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}.$$

□

Proof. The point (i) follows from Theorem 9 directly since $N(f) = 0$ tells us that $f(0) = f(1) = 0$ and $f \in H^1_0$. Then points (ii) and (iii) follow clearly. We use Taylor's expansion of the cosine function at zero. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sin^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{1 - \cos\left(\frac{2k\pi}{n}\right)}{2} = \frac{k^2\pi^2}{n^2} - \frac{1}{2}R_3\left(\frac{2k\pi}{n}\right).$$

Here, the third Lagrange's remainder term satisfies, for some $\theta = \theta\left(\frac{2k\pi}{n}\right) \in (0,1)$,

$$\left|R_3\left(\frac{2k\pi}{n}\right)\right| = \left|\cos^{(4)}\left(\theta \cdot \frac{2k\pi}{n}\right)\right| \cdot \frac{(2k\pi)^4}{4! \cdot n^4} \leq \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)^4.$$

This implies that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$0 < 1 - \frac{n^2}{k^2\pi^2} \sin^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right) = \frac{n^2}{2k^2\pi^2} \cdot \left| R_3\left(\frac{2k\pi}{n}\right)\right| \leq \frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)^2.$$

Hence, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\,\frac{1}{n}.$$

This proves (iv).

Moreover, if k is fixed and nonzero, we have that for any $\theta \in (0,1)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \cos^{(4)}\left(\theta \cdot \frac{2k\pi}{n}\right) = 1.$$

This leads to

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} e(A^k_{n+1}, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) \cdot n = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}},$$

as claimed in (v). □

We comment on Theorems 9 and 17. Theorem 17 deals with $k \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash\{0\}$ and equidistant nodes, while Theorem 9 works even for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. However, Theorem 9 studies only the space H^1_0 instead of H^1.

For $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$, the same statements, as in Theorem 17, hold true for the space H^1_0, since the spline algorithm is optimal. Due to the zero boundary values, the number of information is $n-1$ for H^1_0, instead of $n+1$. This is indeed a special case of Theorem 9.

Moreover, thanks to the equidistant nodes including endpoints, the formula in point (i) of Theorem 17 remains valid for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ (and H^1), as well as points (iii)-(v). In the computation of $r(N, H^1)$, we usually work with

$$N(f) = \left(f(0), f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \ldots, f\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right), f(1)\right) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad f \in H^1([0,1]).$$

This is equivalent to the computation of $r(N_1, H^1_0)$ in Theorem 9 with

$$N_1(f) = \left(f\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \ldots, f\left(\frac{n-1}{n}\right)\right) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad f \in H^1_0([0,1]).$$

That is shortly, for $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$,

$$e(A_{n+1}^k, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1) = r(N, H^1) = \sup_{\substack{f\in H^1:\, \|f\|\le 1 \\ N(f)=0}} |I_\varrho(f)| = \sup_{\substack{f\in H_0^1:\, \|f\|\le 1 \\ N_1(f)=0}} |I_\varrho(f)|$$
$$= r(N_1, H_0^1) = \frac{1}{2\pi|k|}\left(1 - \frac{n^2}{k^2\pi^2}\sin^2\left(\frac{k\pi}{n}\right)\right)^{1/2}.$$

Remark 18. It is easy to prove that these asymptotic statements (iii) and (v) also hold for optimal nodes, i.e., for the numbers $e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1)$ with $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$. More precisely, for fixed n and $k \to \infty$, one can take $L_0 = L_n = 0$ in Theorem 13 to get the asymptotic property of $e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1)$. For fixed $k \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ and $n \to \infty$, Theorem 13 gives by Taylor's expansions the same asymptotic constant for $e(n, I_{\varrho_k}, H^1)$ since $x^* < \frac{1}{2n}$ and $\frac{1}{n} < \frac{1-2x^*}{n-1} < \frac{1}{n-1}$. Finally, together with Corollary 10, we find out the same asymptotic constants, $1/(2\pi)$ and $1/(2\sqrt{3})$, for both the spaces H_0^1 and H^1.

Acknowledgement

This work was started while S. Zhang was visiting Theoretical Numerical Analysis Group at Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena. He is extremely grateful for their hospitality.

References

[1] N. D. Boltaev, A. R. Hayotov and Kh. M. Shadimetov, Construction of optimal quadrature formula for Fourier coefficients in Sobolev space $L_2^{(m)}(0,1)$, *Numerical Algorithms*, in press, DOI: 10.1007/s11075-016-0150-7, 2016.

[2] H. Brass and K. Petras, *Quadrature Theory: The Theory of Numerical Integration on a Compact Interval*, AMS Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, Vol. **178**, 363 pp, Rhode Island, 2011.

[3] P. G. Ciarlet, *The Finite Element Method for Elliptic Problems*, Classics in applied mathematics **40**, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, 2002.

[4] D. Huybrechs and S. Olver, Highly oscillatory quadrature, Chapter 2 in: *Highly Oscillatory Problems*, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser. **366**, Cambridge, pp. 25–50, 2009.

[5] H. J. Landau, Necessary density conditions for sampling and interpolation of certain entire functions, *Acta Math.* **117**(1): 37–52, 1967.

[6] P. D. Lax and A. N. Milgram, Parabolic equations, *Ann. of Math.* **33**, 167–190, 1954.

[7] M. Mishali and Y. C. Eldar, Blind multiband signal reconstruction: compressed sensing for analog signals, *IEEE Trans. Signal Processing* **57**(3), CiteSeerX: 10.1.1.154.4255, 2009.

[8] E. Novak, M. Ullrich and H. Woźniakowski, Complexity of oscillatory integration for univariate Sobolev spaces, *J. Complexity* **31**, 15–41, 2015.

[9] E. Novak, M. Ullrich, H. Woźniakowski and S. Zhang, Complexity of oscillatory integrals on the real line, submitted, arXiv: 1511.05414 [math. NA], 2015.

[10] J. F. Traub, G. W. Wasilkowski and H. Woźniakowski, *Information-Based Complexity*, Academic Press, 1988.

[11] J. F. Traub and H. Woźniakowski, *A General Theory of Optimal Algorithms*, Academic Press, 1980.

[12] A. A. Žensykbaev, Best quadrature formula for some classes of periodic differentiable functions, *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.* **41**(5), 1110–1124, 1977 (in Russian); English transl., Math. USSR Izv. **41**(5), 1055–1071, 1977.